

**PATENT
ATTY DOCKET NO SAA-42**

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated July 16, 2003, claims 1-20 are pending and have been rejected by the examiner. Claims 1, 4, 11, and 13-16 have been amended in the present Amendment.

35 USC 112

In the Office Action dated July 16, 2003, claims 1, 4, 7, 11, 13-16, and 17 have been rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. Applicant notes that claims 1, 4, 11, and 13-16 are modified by the present amendment to conform to the requirements of 35 USC 112, second paragraph.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the examiner on the question of whether "transmitting an object" is defined and whether the term "object" is vague. The term "object" is supported in the specification at page 4 lines 12-15. At lines 23-24, the structure of the object is defined as a data type and data structure that includes both data and functions. At page 4 lines 12-15 this object can be user defined in the intelligent automation devices application program. The data is the information from the network device 20 collected by the automation network 10 and acted on by the human being notified by the display device 16 at lines 19-21. Lines 24-27 goes on to provide examples of objects. The specification further defines devices that use the objects at lines 27-28.

Examples of the "object" structure defined on page 4 lines 23-24 are provided on page 5 line 9. Furthermore, the claim itself defines a limitation of the invention as requiring the object, as defined by its functions page 4 line 24, to be responsive to the "signal" obtained from the network device 20 via the backplane contained (and known to one skilled in the art) in the intelligent automation device 12. Refer to page 5 lines 4-5. Thus, the object transmitted must contain functions, which allow the receiving device 16

**PATENT
ATTY DOCKET NO SAA-42**

to allow the human operator to respond to the notification signal. This is supported at page 2 lines 21-22; lines 26-28; page 3 lines 28-31; page 4 lines 6-10; and page 6 lines 17-19. In addition, the object is defined as being created by a programmer, page 4 lines 12-15, provided the object has at least the content specified on page 4 lines 23-24.

35 USC 102

Applicants have reviewed the examiner's rejection under 35 USC 102 in light of Gaw (International Application Publication WO 98/53581), and respectfully disagree with the interpretation of the Gaw publication. 35 USC 102 requires that the alleged publication contain each and every limitation of the claim in question. However, Gaw does not describe at least two distinct limitations of the independent claims of the present application.

Gaw describes an architecture where the Objects (Embedded Applets) are located on the Receiving Device (Client Workstation). There is no indication in the Gaw of the Objects being located on the server or the Network Devices. Furthermore, there is no indication in Gaw of the transmission of the Objects to the Receiving Device (Client Workstation). However, each of the claims 1, 7, and 17 of the present application require the Objects to be located separately from and to be transmitted to the Receiving Device, in response to a signal.

In claim 1, the claim reads "...transmitting an object from said intelligent automation device to a receiving device...the object being responsive to the signal". Gaw does not anticipate this limitation. Furthermore, Gaw does not anticipate the transmission in response to the signal, as in the present claim.

In claim 7, the claims reads "...wherein the intelligent automation device transmits the object to the receiving device to notify the operator...". Gaw does not anticipate this limitation.

**PATENT
ATTY DOCKET NO SAA-42**

In claim 17, the claim reads "...wherein the intelligent automation device transmits the object to the receiving device...". Gaw does not anticipate this limitation.

Since claims 2-6, 8-16, and 18-20 are dependent claims that are based upon independent claims that are not anticipated, then these claims can not be anticipated by Gaw.

35 USC 103

The July 16th Office Action includes a rejection under 35 USC 103(a) for claims 5, 12-14, 16, and 20 over Gaw in combination with several other references.

First of all, each of these rejections is based upon the premise that Gaw discloses the method or notification systems of claims 1, 7, or 17. However, as described above, Gaw does not anticipate the location of objects outside of the Receiving Device nor does Gaw anticipate the transmission of the objects to the Receiving Device based upon a signal. Since claims 5, 12-14, 16, and 20 are based upon independent claims that are valid, there can be no rejection.

Furthermore, under 35 USC 103 (a), it must be obvious to combine references that contain, separately, each limitation of the claim in question. In claims 5, 12, and 20, the rejection is based upon the combination of Gaw with Krivoshein. Krivoshein discloses a programmable logic controller configuration system. It does not disclose the transmission of objects nor the storage of objects outside of the Receiving Device. As such, neither Gaw nor Krivoshein provide, in combination, all of the elements, so the combination of these references does not render these claims obvious.

Claims 13 and 16 are rejected in the office action based upon Gaw in view of Harris. Harris describes XML and WML. However, it does not provide for the storage of objects outside of the Receiving Device nor the transmission of these objects in response

**PATENT
ATTY DOCKET NO SAA-42**

to a signal. As such, neither Gaw nor Harris provide, in combination, all of the elements, so the combination of these references does not render these claims obvious.

Claim 14 is rejected in the office action based upon Gaw in view of Vaio. Vaio describes WAP. However, it does not provide for the storage of objects outside of the Receiving Device nor the transmission of these objects based upon the reception of a signal. As such, neither Gaw nor Vaio provide, in combination, all of the elements, so the combination of these references does not render these claims obvious.

Accordingly, Applicants submit that, in light of the above remarks, claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections and to allow the claims to issue. The commissioner is authorized to charge deposit account 19-3875 (SAA-42) for any fees associated herein.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
Michael J. Femal, Reg. No. 27,784

SCHNEIDER ELECTRIC AUTOMATION BUSINESS
1415 South Roselle Road
Palatine, IL 60067
Telephone: 847/925-3452
Facsimile: 847/925-7419

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
OCT 16 2003

OFFICIAL